

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1, 6, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26-28, 32, 33, 35, 39, 40, 43-46, 48, 52, 53 and 56-59 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-60 remain pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph Rejection of Claims:

In the Office Action, claims 5, 9, 10, 11, 16, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33, 39, 43, 44, 46, 52, 56, 57 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, the dependencies of claims 5, 9, 10, 11, 16, 22, 26, 27, 28, 33, 39, 43, 44, 46, 52, 56, 57 and 59 have been changed to overcome the indefiniteness rejection of those claims.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 14-16, 18-21, 31-33, 35-38, 45-46, 48-51 and 58-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,949,412 to Huntsman; claims 5, 13, 17, 22, 30, 34, 39, 47, 52 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huntsman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105 to Martin, Jr. et al.; claims 6-9, 23-26, 40-43 and 53-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huntsman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,710,790 to Fagioli; claims 10-11, 27-28, 44 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huntsman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,363 to Rosenblatt et al; and claims 12 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huntsman in view of

Walsh et al. (DocBook: The Definitive Guide, October, 1999). These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims, for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Huntsman discloses the claimed screen analysis means and the screen information transmission means. However, this assertion is incorrect with respect to presently pending claim 1. In particular, claim 1 recites that the screen analysis means determines whether or not an active window is present on the screen of said device to be operated, and if so, said screen analysis means obtains property information of objects displayed on said active window, and

wherein said screen information transmission means transmits only the data of the active window and the objects displayed therein, to said operation side terminal, and does not transmit any information on the screen of said device to be operated that does not correspond to the active window. In Huntsman, on the other hand, all information from the display of the first “controlled” computer is provided to the second “controlling” computer, whereby no determination is made as to which window is active on the screen of the first computer so that only that information is send to the second computer.

Accordingly, presently pending claim 1 is not anticipated by Huntsman. Presently pending independent claims 18, 35 and 48 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 1, and thus those claims are also not anticipated by Huntsman.

Also, with respect to the rejection of dependent claim 6, that claim now recites that the screen change detection means determines that the change that occurred in the display of the screen is completed when no screen change is detected in the display of the screen for more than a predetermined time period. In the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli, whereby the Office Action asserted that Fagioli disclosed a screen change detection means. While column 8, lines 16-21 of Fagioli discloses the detection of changes in the host computer display bitmap in order to generate messages to the remote application, there is no teaching or suggestion in Fagioli of having a time-out feature for determining when a change in the display of a screen at the host computer is completed based on no screen change being detected for at least a predetermined time period.

Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli. Presently pending dependent claims 23, 40 and 53 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claim 6, and thus those claims are also patentable over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli.

With respect to dependent claims 7-9, the Office Action also rejects those claims over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli. However, these claims recite that the screen analysis means detects GUI widgets displayed on the screen, as well as attribute data of the GUI widgets. Fagioli, on the other hand, merely discloses that a new position of the moveable portion rectangle is calculated, in order to provide a new disposition of the active window on the display of the remote control computer. There is no teaching or suggestion in Fagioli of providing GUI widget information along with the x,y,z coordinate position data of the active window.

Accordingly, claims 7-9 are patentable over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli. Presently pending dependent claims 24, 25, 41, 42 and 55 recite features similar to those recited in claims 7-9, and thus those claims are also patentable over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli.

With respect to dependent claims 15 and 16, these claims now recite that the screen analysis means does not perform any picture data extraction when moving picture or still picture is not displayed on the screen of said device to be operated. In its rejection of claims 15 and 16, the Office Action asserts that Huntsman's disclosure of using Windows SDK API to read a computer screen and store the resulting bitmap in a data structure anticipates the features of claims 15 and 16. However, it appears that Huntsman teaches the use of the Windows SDK API irrespective as to whether or not a moving picture or a still picture exists on the screen (that is, Huntsman's system will perform bit map extraction all the time, whether or not a still picture or moving picture exists on the screen), and thus Huntsman cannot anticipate the features recited in presently pending claims 15 and 16.

Accordingly, claims 15 and 16 are not anticipated by Huntsman. Presently pending dependent claims 32, 33, 45, 46, 58 and 59 have been amended in a manner similar to the amendments made to claims 15 and 16, and thus those claims are also patentable over the combination of Huntsman and Fagioli.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 27, 2005

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257

Phillip J. Articola
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,819